



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/249,642	02/12/1999	QUAN A. VU	SONY-11300	1161

28960 7590 03/13/2003

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP  
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER

WILSON, JACQUELINE B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2612

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/249,642**

Applicant(s)  
**Vu et al.**

Examiner  
**Jacqueline Wilson**

Art Unit  
**2612**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 30, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2612

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants arguments are substantially the same as previous responses.

The applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach a data stream forming x number of first data blocks each containing n units of data, forming y number of second data blocks each containing m units of data and combining x and y number of data blocks to achieve the predetermined rate. Again the examiner strongly disagrees. With reference to column 6, Staats specifically teaches that the transmitter needs to send 266 packets and sometimes send 267 packets (lines 7+). Staats teaches that to send data which is NTSC compatible, the signal must achieve a proper synchronization of 266.5 packets. In doing so, 266 and 267 packets must be sent in order to achieve this goal. The term "sometimes" is believed to be used to teach that it 267 packets are placed in stream at certain times to in order to produce the NTSC compatible signal but not placed in the signal as constantly as 266, thus, maintaining a proper stream of data (predetermined rate). This is still synonymous to the claimed first and second data blocks with n and m units of data and to the claimed "evenly distributed". Therefore, again, the examiner maintains her rejection using Staats teachings..

Regarding Claim 26, the examiner acknowledges the Staats does not specifically disclose forming 9336 first frames wherein each of the first frames contains 267 packets of data and 664

Art Unit: 2612

second frames wherein each of the second frames contains 266 packets of data. However, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a certain amount of frames would be present in the data packets, a higher number in the 267 packet. Depending on manufacturer at the time the invention was made, it is an matter of design choice how many frames per packet is desired. It does not change the scope of the invention whether or not 664 frames are present or 1000 frames are present. The examiner still believes that based on what is to be transmitted (amount of frames) will depend on the manufacturer's desires. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 26 is maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-20, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Staats (US 6,373,821).

Regarding Claim 1, Staats'821 teaches transmitting information from a source device at a predetermined rate comprising forming x number of first data blocks wherein each of the first data blocks contains n units of data (267 packets/frame; col. 6, lines 7+), and forming y number

Art Unit: 2612

of second data blocks wherein each of the second data blocks contains  $m$  units of data (266 packets/frame) wherein  $m$  is not equal to  $n$ . Staats'821 further teaches that each data stream contains these data packets in which 266 packets/frame of data is transmitted and sometimes 267 are need to be transmitted. This inherently teaches combining  $x$  number of first data blocks and  $y$  number of second data blocks into a data stream to achieve the predetermined rate, wherein the first data blocks and the second data blocks are of a same type and have the same characteristics (video data).

Regarding Claim 2, Staats'821 teaches transmitting the data stream from the source device at the predetermined rate (col. 10, lines 57+ teaches the host is programmed to begin transmission of data at a desired cycle).

Regarding Claim 3, Staats'821 teaches the actual frame transmission time may be compared with a predicted transmission time to maintain frame synchronization (col. 10, lines 46-53). This is broadly interpreted as evenly distributing the  $x$  number of first data blocks among the  $y$  number of second data blocks since the device insists on maintaining the data stream to be synchronized.

Regarding Claim 4, Staats'821 teaches digital video data (col. 3, lines 30-33).

Regarding Claim 5, Staats'821 teaches  $n$ ,  $m$ ,  $x$ , and  $y$  are integer values ( $x$  and  $y$  are each frame, and  $n$  and  $m$  are 266 and 267).

Claim 6 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1 (source and receiving devices are the host computer and camera).

Art Unit: 2612

Claim 7 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Claim 8 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 2 with the further limitation of the data stream conforming to the standards of an IEEE 1394-1995 network (col. 3, lines 24+).

Claim 9 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 3. (See rejection of Claim 3 above.)

Claim 10 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 8. (See rejection of Claim 8 above.)

Regarding Claim 11, Staats'821 teaches the source and receiving device are coupled together within a network (see fig. 1).

Claim 12 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 8. (See rejection of Claim 8 above.)

Claim 13 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1. (See rejection of Claim 1 above.)

Claim 14 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Regarding Claim 15, Staats'821 teaches an interface coupled to the controller and configured for connecting to a network (fig. 1, 12).

Claim 16 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 8. (See rejection of Claim 8 above.)

Art Unit: 2612

Claim 17 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1. (See rejection of Claim 1 above.)

Claim 18 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 5. (See rejection of Claim 5 above.)

Claim 19 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6 (see also col. 8, lines 15-16). (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Claim 20 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 6 and 19 . (See rejection of Claims 6 and 19 above.)

Claim 23 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 8. (See rejection of Claim 8 above.)

Claim 24 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 6 and 11. (See rejection of Claims 6 and 11 above.)

Claim 25 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 8. (See rejection of Claim 8 above.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2612

5. Claims 21-22, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Staats'821.

Regarding Claim 21, Staats'821 does not specifically disclose the predetermined rate is 29.97 frames per second. However, it is notoriously well known in the art to transmit signal conforming to standard television signals (29.97 frames per second). By performing this method allows for images to be seen on a monitor desirably. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the predetermined rate to be 29.97 frames per second.

Regarding Claim 22, Staats'821 teaches the x packets represent 267 packets and the y packets represent 266 packets as discussed in Claim 1, but fails to specifically disclose the plurality of second frames are 9336 frames and the plurality of second frames are 664 frames. However, this is an obvious matter of design choice by the manufacturer at the time of production to manufacture such values with respect to the transmission scheme, for it does not change the scope of the invention.

Claims 26 and 27 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 8. Although Staats'821 teaches 267 packets and 266 packets as discussed in Claim 1, Staats'821 fails to specifically disclose the first frames are 9336 frames and second frames are 664 frames. However, this is an obvious matter of design choice by the manufacturer at the time of production to manufacture such values with respect to the transmission scheme, for it does not change the scope of the invention.



Art Unit: 2612

Furthermore, Staats'821 does not specifically disclose the predetermined frame rate is 29.97 frames per second. However, it is notoriously well known in the art to transmit signal conforming to standard television signals (29.97 frames per second). By performing this method allows for images to be seen on a monitor desirably. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the predetermined rate to be 29.97 frames per second.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2612

7. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to **Jacqueline Wilson** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday (alternate Fridays off) from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached at (703) 305-4929. The fax number for this group is (703)872-9314.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or Faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communication intended for entry)

**or:**


(703) 872-9314, (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

JBW

March 4, 2003

  
**WENDY R. GARBER**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600